DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 481 713 SP 041 769

AUTHOR Livingston, Donald R.

TITLE Reclaiming Early Childhood Teacher Education: A Critical Constructivist Approach.

PUB DATE 2003-11-00

NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Regional Association of Teacher Educators (50th, Savannah, GA, November 19-22, 2003).

PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Child Development; *Constructivism (Learning); *Early Childhood Education; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Psychology

IDENTIFIERS Dewey (John)

ABSTRACT

Through a discussion of the discursive origins that have constructed childhood over the past 200 years, this paper illuminates why psychology has gained a dominant role in the education of young children. This historical account is followed by an analysis of widely used textbooks in child development courses. Discovering that each textbook presents only theoretical perspectives that privilege the individual, the argument is made that these perspectives exclude other ways of thinking about the individual in relationship to the larger society. Because of psychology's dominance in the early childhood discourse, early childhood teacher education programs have become a domesticated curriculum for social change. Distraught that this dominant perspective is disastrous for young children, a reclaiming of the early childhood teacher education curriculum is proposed based on critical constructivist theory. Critical constructivism is an activist theory, a theoretical orientation that can trace its roots to critical and poststructural conceptions, as well as social reconstructionism. By presenting a case that critical constructivism is, in a fundamental way, a return to an earlier perspective found in the writings of John Dewey, this essay suggests that psychology ought to be a tool for philosophical ends intended to improve society. (Contains 15 references.) (Author/SM)

Running head: A CRITICAL CONSTRUCTIVIST APPROACH

Reclaiming Early Childhood Teacher Education:

A Critical Constructivist Approach

Donald R. Livingston

LaGrange College

601 Broad Street

LaGrange, GA 30240

dlivingston@lagrange.edu

Don Livingston holds the post of Assistant Professor of Education at LaGrange College, Georgia, US where he teaches early childhood education courses. His research interests include curriculum theory and educational policy analysis.

Abstract

Through a discussion of the discursive origins that have constructed childhood over the past two hundred years, this paper illuminates why psychology has gained a dominant role in the education of young children. This historical account is followed by an analysis of widely used textbooks in child development courses. Discovering that each textbook presents only theoretical perspectives that privilege the individual, the argument is made that these perspectives exclude other ways of thinking about the individual in relationship to the larger society. Because of psychology's dominance in the early childhood discourse, early childhood teacher education programs have become a domesticated curriculum for social change. Distraught that this dominant perspective is disastrous for young children, a reclaiming of the early childhood teacher education curriculum is proposed based on critical constructivist theory. Critical constructivism is an activist theory, a theoretical orientation that can trace its roots to critical and poststructural conceptions, as well as social reconstructionism. By presenting a case that critical constructivism is, in a fundamental way, a return to an earlier perspective found in the writings of John Dewey, this essay suggests that psychology ought to be a tool for philosophical ends intended to improve society.

Reclaiming Early Childhood Teacher Education: A Critical Constructivist Approach

Phillip's (1995) wry observation that constructivism has become akin to a secular religion with many sects makes the point that while there is widespread agreement among early childhood teacher educators that knowledge is constructed, the field remains contentious about what disciplines, philosophies and social theories ought to be privileged in the curriculum. Although there is a lively ongoing debate in some academic circles about what should be emphasized in the early childhood curriculum, or not, on the street level, back at most colleges and universities, child psychology dominates the stage. Largely accepted, often without discussion, child psychology has been elevated to sacerdotal status, making it the official knowledge pre-service early childhood teachers must know to be proclaimed "competent" (Apple, 1992). As we strive to teach our pre-service teachers to master "appropriate" psychologically based practices of teaching, we, as teacher educators, rarely stop to critically examine these discourses. Although our constructivist-based early childhood teacher education programs are not intended to be a monolithic form of training, the end result is often a pre-service teacher who embraces psychological determinism as the only way young children learn new knowledge (McLaren, 1998; Cannella, 1998). Robbed of its Deweyan tradition over time, the dominant constructivist theory used to teach young children has become so psychologized that the theory has been domesticated into a cookbook series of teaching techniques (McLaren, 1998; Freire, 1998). This psychological interpretation of constructivism reduces pedagogy to the efficient delivery of instruction in the form of carefully crafted performance-based lesson plans and teacher chosen thematic units that are perfectly aligned with the state's mandated curriculum (Cannella, 1998). From a theoretical perspective, developmental, and hierarchical, assimilation/accommodation models have become an educational metanarrative that crowds out

other voices that pre-service teachers might want to know about (Cherryholmes, 1988). Because we have gone too long without questioning the assumptions that drive early childhood teacher education, this paper intends to put the hegemony of psychology in the early childhood teacher education curriculum into crisis by challenging the field to open pathways to a broader palette of philosophic, economic, political, and social theories. Although it may seem nostalgic, I argue for a reclaiming of early childhood education once articulated by John Dewey, who insisted that philosophy is the theory of education. While it may seem radical to challenge the present state of psychologism in early childhood teacher education programs, it is actually a return to orthodoxy with an emphasis on social justice, community and the philosophical aspects of schooling as proposed by Dewey.

Childhood as a Discursive Construction

Historically, discursive power has determined to what degree and in what way a child uses the social in support of the self (Foucault, 1980). When examined in this way, childhood is essentially a narrative seen through the lens of the particular discourses that dominate at any given point in history. Bernadette Baker's (2001) book, *In perpetual motion: Theories of power, educational history, and the child,* is particularly useful here because she illuminates the discursive factors that have influenced the construction of childhood through four writers who have shaped our views of children and education – John Locke, Jean Jacques Rousseau, Johann Herbart, and G. Stanley Hall.

Baker (2001) credits Locke with significantly changing the conception of humanity and childhood by writing that the body does exist with a mind that can be shaped and formed by influences other than nature. Basic to his philosophy, Locke believed that all ideas come from experience and that the conception of the child is constant changing. Before Locke, many

assumed that everything unfolded according to a natural plan and that the mind had no affect on the outcome. The dominant perception held today, that the child is a biological structure influenced by a social exterior, is a modern thought promulgated by John Locke in the eighteenth century. Although Locke's writings about the child as an empty vessel have been embraced by the behavioral perspective, Phillips (1995) makes the case that because Locke was the progenitor of the idea that knowledge is constructed, he ought to be situated at the far end of the conservative constructivist spectrum. It's hard to argue that Locke's principles are not, in a fundamental way, consistent with constructivism.

As for Rousseau, Baker (2001) places his work, *Emile,* at the onset of a truer sense of child-centeredness. By studying a child's nature, Rousseau believed that educational decisions would be made to create pedagogy more sensitive to the needs of the child. Further, Rousseau positioned the child as the center of authority by recognizing that the child ought to decide what knowledge is worth learning. Although Locke and Rousseau differed on the subject of pedagogical authority, both writers viewed the education of the child in terms of the political and philosophical.

Theorizing about the child through a political and philosophical discourse began to shift towards a psychological conception as evidenced by the writings of Johann Friedrich Herbart (Baker, 2001). Ripe discursive conditions, such as the formalization of teaching in the late nineteenth century, enabled Herbart to emphasize psychological instructional processes to make children intelligent so that they would become moral. Convinced that psychology was a true science, Herbart made the argument that the mind was made up of categories that could be stimulated with precision, at the optimum moment, to produce a desired result. Herbart went as far as to think of aesthetics as a science where sophistication was a quantifiable construct (Baker,

2001). With these empirical views of psychology's applications to human learning, Herbart's writings helped changed the discourse of education away from the political and philosophical and towards the psychological.

Fundamental change toward a psychological pedagogy was precipitated through the discursive influences articulated by G. Stanley Hall and the American Child-Study Movement. Building upon the developmentalism of the Herbartians, Hall's Child-Study Movement made the claim that "stages of development ...are scientifically valid [and] should be the determining principle for the very structure of public schooling, who should attend, and all teacherly action undertaken therein" (Baker, 2001, p. 428). Clearly, the American Child-Study Movement laid the groundwork for today's theoretical perspectives as biosociological givens, perspectives that dominate the early childhood education discourse today.

The Dominant Discourse in Child Development

From a reading of widely used child development textbooks published by major publishing houses, [1] dominant themes about the theoretical perspectives of child development emerge. Psychodynamic theories focus on the inner struggles the child experiences through the super-ego, ego, id, conscious, and subconscious. Psychosocial theories explain the development of the individual organism as it progresses through life. Various behavioral theories make the case that the environment imprints the body with codes used to facilitate learning. Cognitive perspectives rely on an assimilation/accommodation model and the brain as a computing machine. Contextual theories take their cues from bioecological or sociocultural models. Although each of these theoretical perspectives vary in respect to how knowledge is acquired by the individual, central to all is the primacy that the biological organism is the controlling mechanism in the negotiation and formation of knowledge and of identity. The primary message

resonating from these texts is one that frames childhood as a developmental sojourn in which a biological organism wrestles with the forces of nature and the social to create a unified identity as an individual. Throughout every text, the dominant discourse is one that positions the individual as the locus of learning and identity.

The unsolvable conundrum that arises when these theories that privilege unification at the site of the body take hold, is that the individual is constantly engaged in infinite phenomenological inquiries in an attempt to discover a true self. Much like opening up the cover of a baseball and then trying to explain why each strand of string is woven the way it is, these forms of inquiry can describe why some things operate the way they do but can never quite explain all of it. In the process of searching for the essence of the self, individuals perpetually defer the formation of their identity because these psychological theories limit understandings of others by erecting a barrier between the self and the social. Thus, the individual never establishes an existential center, a position where the person is capable of understanding the standpoint of others (Deleuze & Guatarri, 1989). Turning individual psychology upside down, John Dewey's perspective was one where "human nature is not merely adaptation of a biological organism to the environment in which it finds itself. One of its distinguishing characteristics, on the contrary, is that it can adapt the environment to itself. In a measure, it creates its environment, and in doing so, creates itself" (Nathanson, 1951, p. 52).

Toward a Philosophy of Psychology

The early childhood educational discourse today is mired in psycholgisms of every kind. Stagnated at best, moribund at worst, by this situation, our field needs to reconceptualize itself with fresh ideas. John Dewey's words are, once again, particularly sagacious, "What is the matter? I think it lies with our lack of imagination in generating leading ideas" (Dewey, 1931, p.

11). John Dewey, possibly more than any other scholar, generated leading ideas in the field of education. One of the basic leading ideas put forth by Dewey is "how the outer world affects us and how do we affect it" (Nathanson, 1951, p. 67). For Dewey, the purpose of education is to develop agents for social reform (Fishman & McCarthy, 1998). Dewey's (1931) insistence that education's purpose is to produce agents of change "who courageously scrutinize accepted beliefs in the service of uncertain but shared future" (p. 55) is both a social reconstructionist and a deconstructivist idea. Because civilization is always changing, education must not be the process of adjusting the individual to civilization, instead, Dewey was adamant that the goal of education is not to make the individual comfortable and an efficient member of society just as it is (Dewey, 1899).

Privileging philosophy over all other disciplines, Dewey was clear that, "Thinking...is the most difficult occupation in which man engages" (Dewey, 1931, p. 296). Dewey, as did Herbart (Dunkel, 1969), viewed psychology as a means to an end, an end which sought schools to transform society through democratic ideals. Situating psychology within this philosophical context, Dewey (1899) said that,

> Socialization works through the medium of the individual to put everything in himself at the disposal of the community, not merely to do habitual things, but his power to invent, to do new things which will be useful to society... To bring the child to consciousness of himself in a social way as a social being is a process which definitely recognizes the whole significance of the social function in education, but which also recognizes at every step the psychological factor. (p. 97)

Although Dewey studied under G. Stanley Hall at the University of Chicago, he found the dominant psychology of Hall and the American Child Study Movement empiricistic, atomistic and analytic. What Hall's theories lacked was an account for the social, a critical component in the complete description of the psychological experience (Dewey, 1899). To Dewey, social forces decided particular "habits" or "results,"

> The typical psychological definition is that education is the harmonious development of the various powers of the individual. Now certainly education is that, or ought to be that. In other words, the definition is not false, but it is inadequate, it does not explain itself, and when it is set up as final and complete, then it becomes self-contradictory. What do we mean by power? What do we mean by development? What do we mean by harmonious? (Dewey, 1899, p. 88)

What we have learned from Dewey is that early childhood educators must question all assumptions that surround the life of the child. As a for instance, Cannella (1998) questions developmental theory as well as its accompanying sacred text, developmentally appropriate practice. Although, these tenets of progressive child development are widely accepted to be foundational to the field of early childhood, do these assumptions explain all of it? In terms of power, does the belief that the child passes through specific stages of development, continually progressing toward a higher level, deny "children the power, reality, and agency of the present?" (Cannella, 1998, p. 162).

Developmental theory creates the child as "Other", a dualistic explanation of the relationships between childhood and adulthood. Dewey rejected dualisms of every sort; he found them to be the bane of the intellectual process (Fishman & McCarthy, 1998). Rather than a binary explanation, Dewey insisted that phenomena be viewed as messy business. As a trope for

child development, Dewey would prefer a definition of the psychological condition as a hyphenated child-adult. Although his rejection of the student and curriculum dualism is well know in progressive circles, Dewey was adamant about the disastrous outcomes we will experience if the dualism between individual and society continues (Nathanson, 1951). For Dewey (1899),

> The psychological definition throws us over to the social side to get its meaning decided, and when we are on the social side we must go back to the psychological side to get any basis. Is there any way out of the circle? Otherwise we seem to be in the condition described by the gentleman who said there were two theories neither of which were true, but each was useful counteracting the errors of the other. The question is whether there is any unified point of view with reference to which we can interpret both the psychological and the sociological factors in education. (p. 93)

Believing that human nature changes and not all experience is psychic in character, Dewey's stance for education begins from a social standpoint and borrows from psychology along the way to reach these social goals (Dewey, 1899). The problem that Dewey has with an over-reliance on psychology was that it makes instruction mechanical (Dewey, 1899). Although Dewey subordinated psychology, he did not dismiss its importance for making connections between the psychological and the social so the child intrinsically can connect with instruction. As an instrument for a social philosophy, psychology can be a useful technique, but the aim is to bring the child into "consciousness as a social affair" (Dewey, 1899, p. 99).

Perspicacious throughout his writings, Dewey's philosophy of psychology is that we mustn't take psychological concepts as givens. Rather than think of the self as a unified construct

housed in a body, Dewey challenged us to think of the self as expressed in social patterns and institutions (Nathanson, 1951). He often used the word "ourselves" rather than "self" to emphasize that we are largely social in origin (Nathanson, 1951). "Shared experience is the greatest of human goods" (p. 103) sums up Dewey's psychology as a philosophy - where philosophy is the criticism of criticisms (Nathanson, 1951).

As Dewey pointed out, constructing knowledge is not a spectator sport, nor is it an individual sport; knowledge is constructed out of social relations (Phillips, 1995). Returning to these Deweyan roots, what early childhood teacher education needs to revisit the writings of Dewey laced with an injection of critical poststructural theory to deconstruct the psychological discourse that grips early childhood teacher education programs (Campoy, 2000). Granted, early childhood teacher education programs ought to prepare teachers to facilitate individual cognition, yet these programs also have a responsibility to encourage teachers of young children to become active citizens who assume leadership roles in the political process. By encouraging active participation in political systems, early childhood educators can promote social change to improve the lives of our children. Through an emphasis on social problems, what McLaren (1998) and Cannella (1998) refer to as critical constructivism, the early childhood teacher education curriculum can expand its scope beyond understanding childhood as mostly a developmental psychological process. Consistent with feminist epistemologies that claim that sociopolitical processes determine how knowledge is valued, critical constructivists suggest that much of what our children learn in schools will not significantly contribute to, or substantially improve, their lives (Phillips, 1998). In the sense that all knowledge is constructed out of social relations, critical constructivism is a radical departure from a psychological understanding of constructivism that is significantly influenced by the biological characteristics of the child

(Latour, 1992). Critical constructivism's epistemology characterizes truth as subjective, a phenomena created by human beings, and dependent on the negotiations, or lack of negotiations, of power relationships between various people (Cannella, 1998).

A discussion of Peter McLaren's critical views on the purpose of teacher education is particularly important here. According to McLaren, writing with Fischman (1998), it has become imperative that teacher education programs engage in dialogue that addresses

> ...the construction of identity and critical citizenship in a world increasingly under the sway of globalization and in the thrall of commodity culture. We believe that the absence of discussion of these issues diminishes the capacity of teacher education programs to participate in the formation of teachers as critical agents of social justice." (p. 126)

Observing that commercialism has turned teacher education programs into marketing agencies, McLaren and Fischman (1998) make the accusation that teacher education programs have been reduced to profit centers. With its focus on efficiency in instruction, teacher education is inextricably entwined in the cash machine that serves both the corporate interests of the academy and the factory model schoolhouse. Instead of concentrating on raising observable measures of academic achievement, teacher education programs should privilege a curriculum of caring, compassion and solidarity. What is needed, say McLaren and Fischman (1998), are activist oriented teacher education programs that expose the hierarchical structures of social relations that exploit the poor. At its heart, teacher education should be an activist curriculum that transforms teachers by exposing the inequities of power and privilege embedded in society.

McLaren (1998) views the critical constructivist approach as "thinking about, negotiating, and transforming the relationships among classroom teaching" (p. 7) by linking the

production of knowledge with the institutional structures of the school. Although he considers critical pedagogy as synonymous with constructivism, he is distraught by a depoliticized, psychologized constructivism that espouses a "tye-dyed optimism of I'm Okay –you're Okay" brand of pedagogy (McLaren, 1998, p.7).

McLaren feels that this "new constructivism" has silenced the social critique from student-centered instruction, making it a domesticated pedagogy whose present position of political neutrality serves the interests of the rich and powerful. Constructivism, in its present form, has become so psychologized that it is conceptually dead as a theory for social justice (McLaren, 1998). For constructivism to be instrumental again, McLaren (1998) urges that constructivism must become a theory that challenges dominant forms of knowledge at the local level. When McLaren's views are applied to teacher education programs, our preservice teachers "become active agents for social transformation and critical citizenship" (p. 447). With social reconstructionist goals of social justice for all groups, McLaren (1998) believes that critical constructivism can be useful in the elimination of classism, racism, sexism, and homophobia.

Taking this critique to early childhood, Gale Cannella's (1998) exposure of psychologized constructivism rips the underpinnings away from this dominant discourse. Calling for a reconceptualization of early childhood education, Cannella (1998) describes how dominant themes in early childhood education are formed within an affluent, white and western sociocultural political discourse. This discourse has become so powerful that most educators have come to accept this perspective as the "truth" about childhood and early childhood education. What must be done, according to Cannella, is a deconstruction of the social and political structures that support the perception that psychologized constructivism is the "true"

pedagogy for young children. Specific to our discussion about the psychologization of childhood, she asks that early childhood educators examine the assumption that all children share universal needs, an assumption which leaps to the conclusion that behaviors and outcomes are universal as well (Cannella, 1998). When our gaze is fixed through a psychological lens, children are viewed as "context-free individuals, independent of time, culture or condition" (Cannella, 1998, p. 159).

Further, Cannella (1998) points out that this psychological construction has led to a construction of the child as "needy", a perception that leads adults to make all of the decisions that determine the child's environment. These decisions are legitimated by empirical studies that use "true experimental" methodology to perpetuate the thinking that children are to be manipulated for their own good. Because cognition is privileged in this psychologized environment, children are not encouraged to use, what Dewey called, the dramatic and the emotional (Nathanson, 1951). Instead, assimilation/accommodation dominates constructivism with a hierarchical model of cognition which follows a universal developmental path regardless of culture or life history (Cannella, 1998). Psychology creates deterministic and reductionist pedagogy that is embedded with the message that learning is always an empirical act that can be observed and quantified. This psychological determinism dominates our pedagogy in the form of lesson plans, units, classroom management techniques and standards (Cannella, 1998).

Using psychological testing, schools assess young children entering kindergarten and throughout the primary grades to determine if they are intellectually and socially competent enough for school or ready for promotion to the next grade. By judging early experiences with a universal set of criteria, these tests suggest that certain culturally constructed experiences are better than others. Yet, it is critical to remember that what is familiar to middle class children may be completely missing from the lives of poor children. As a consequence of our schools'

idolatry of psychology, young children from many cultures do not clear the bar set by these tests. (Cannella, 1998).

When grounded in universal notions of early experience, child rearing becomes normative, a description which categorizes those who do not demonstrate enough normalcy to be labeled as at-risk, deficient, and in need of expert intervention (Cannella, 1998). It most definitely leads early childhood educators to the assumption that there is one right way to raise children. In Cannella's words,

> I would not argue with the notion that children need early experiences in supportive, continuous human relationships. We all need those relationships throughout our lives. However, the idea that early experiences are more important than those that occur later in life and that these experiences must be of a certain type, with particular people, in a given context is a deterministic, power oriented view. Women and children become objects of control; fathers are silenced; and anyone who deviates from predetermined expectations is condemned as ignorant and uncaring (p. 164).

Convinced by these psychological evaluations, many early childhood educators have come to the pernicious belief that tests which purport to measure experiences gained within a particular sort of family are the primary arbiters for school readiness. What's pernicious about a blind belief in the efficacy of deficiency testing is summed up by Michelle Fine (1995), "Fundamentally, the notion of 'risk' keeps us from being broadly, radically, and structurally creative about transforming schools and social conditions for all of today's and tomorrow's youth" (p. 91). Dewey agreed that continuing with the psychological tradition, one which pursues a purely individualistic path, can be attributed directly to neglect of the social conditions

in place today (Dewey, 1899). Tracing its history back to a separation of the social from the individual (Baker, 2001), this neglect denies the continuity of the social by privileging the psychological over other ways of knowing.

Reclaiming the Field

Reclaiming constructivism, as a theory for democratic change, begins with the acknowledgement that the psychological definition of the child is not the child. (Cannella, 1998). Next, early childhood education needs to reposition the role of psychology within constructivist theory. Presently, children are manipulated by a psychological pedagogy that forces them to learn what adults want them to learn. Arguably, it is hard to reconcile psychological constructivist in theoretical terms because progressive curricular conceptions, where constructivism would traditionally be situated, cannot coexist as an overarching approach along side an essentialist one. Although both are individual-oriented conceptually, the two have diametrically opposed epistemologies. From a progressive curricular orientation, the learner is responsible for forming contextual understandings of the disciplines and of content information. Progressivism is intrinsically natured whereas essentialism has an extrinsic orientation. Because the child makes meaning with through the process of negotiation and guidance with the teacher, progressivism does not rely on recipes or educational laws (Fishman & McCarthy, 1998). Essentialism, on the other hand, presents a hard and fixed set of curricular outcomes that must be understood in the same way. In sum, progressivism is a curriculum that teaches for transformation whereas essentialism teaches for transmission of knowledge.

Thus, the choice, if we have one, must be made between psychology in the service of progressive ideals or as a tool for the essentialist curriculum. If we choose to return to the orthodoxy of Dewey's progressivism, do we dare build a new social order by resurrecting social

reconstructionism as a critical theory or do we continue to play the "I'm okay, you're okay" version of the constructivist game? If we choose the former, we must be prepared to fight for social justice and equal opportunity for all children by accepting that there are many ways to know the world (Cannella, 1998). When a critical constructivist approach is adopted, our early childhood teacher education programs would emphasize the revolutionary possibilities that could emerge once democracy and education come together.

Borrowing from Dewey's construction and criticism method, learning to teach in a critical constructivist environment embraces the orthodoxy of constructivism - teaching for the synthesis of new connections, in combination with criticism - the ability to identify, discriminate, and challenge dominant discourses (Fishman & McCarthy, 1998). Synonymous with Dewey's descriptions, critical constructivism is another way of saying "activity methods" and "community-based project approach" (Phillips, 1998). Thus, critical constructivism is congruous with Dewey's conviction that philosophy is the theory of education, because critical constructivism is first and foremost a philosophy not a psychology.

Endnote

[1] The major publishing houses child development textbooks referred to include:

Bukatko, D., & Daehler, M.W. (2004). *Child development: A thematic approach* (5th ed.). New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Feldman, R.S. (2004). *Child development* (3rd ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Hetherington, E.M., & Parke, R.D. (1999). *Child psychology: A contemporary viewpoint* (Rev. ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill College.

Kail, R.V. (2004). *Children and their development* (3rd ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

McDevitt, T.M., & Ormrod, J.E. (2004). *Child development: Educating and working with children and adolescents* (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Siegler, R., Deloache, J., & Eisenberg, N. (2003). *How children develop* (1st ed.). New York: Worth Publishers.

References

Apple, M. (1992). The text and cultural politics. *Educational Review, 21*(7), 4-11.

Baker, B. (2001). *In perpetual motion: Theories of power, educational history, and the child.* New York: Peter Lang.

Campoy, R. (2000). Teacher development: Fostering reflection in a poststructural era. *Contemporary Education, 71*(2), 33-41.

Cannella, G. (1998). Early Childhood Education: a call for the construction of revolutionary images. In W. Pinar (Ed.). *Curriculum: Toward new identities* (pp. 157-184). New York: Garland.

Cherryholmes, C. (1988). *Power and criticisms: Poststructural investigations in education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1989). *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. London: Athlone.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Dewey, J. (1899). Lectures in the philosophy of education:1899 (R. Archambault, Ed., 1966). New York: Random House.

Dewey, J. (1931). *Philosophy and civilization*. New York: Minton, Balch and Company.

Fishman, S., & McCarthy, L. (1998). *John Dewey and the challenge of classroom practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.

McLaren, P., & Fischman, G. (1998). Reclaiming hope: Teacher education and social justice in the age of globalization. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 25*(4), 125-133.

McLaren, P. (1998). Revolutionary pedagogy in post-revolutionary times: rethinking the political economy of critical education. *Educational Theory, 48* (4), 431–463.

Nathanson, J. (1951). *John Dewey: The reconstruction of the democratic life*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Phillips, D. (1995). The Good, the bad, and the ugly: The many faces of constructivism. *Educational Researcher, 24* (7), 5-12.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

ERIC Educational Resources Information Center

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Reclaiming Early Childhood Teacher Education: A critical constructivist approach.	
Author(s): Livingston, Donald R.	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: Donald R. Livingston	Printed Name/Position/Title: Donald R. Livingston Asst Professor	
Organization/Address:	Telephone: 706 880 8017	FAX: 706 880 8319
	E-Mail Address: dlivingston@lagrange.edu	Date: 11/1/03

CLEARINGHOUSE ON TEACHING
AND TEACHER EDUCATION

ERIC
Educational Resources Information Center

September 2, 2003

Dear Presenter:

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education invites you to contribute to the ERIC database by providing us with a copy of your paper presented at the Georgia Association of Teacher Educators 50th Annual Conference (November 19-22, Savannah, GA). Abstracts of documents that are accepted by ERIC are available through computers in both on-line and CD/ROM versions. The ERIC database is accessed worldwide and is used by teachers, administrators, researchers, students, policymakers, and others with an interest in education.

AACTE
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
1307
NEW YORK AVE., NW
SUITE 300
WASHINGTON, DC
20005-4701
202/293-2450
FAX: 202/457-8095

Inclusion of your work provides you with a permanent archive and contributes to the overall development of materials in ERIC. The full text of your contribution will be accessible at libraries throughout the country and through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. Documents are reviewed and accepted based on their contribution to education, timeliness, relevance, methodology, effectiveness of presentation, and reproduction quality.

To disseminate your work through ERIC, you need to fill out and sign the **Reproduction Release Form** located on the back of this letter and include it with a letter-quality copy of your paper. You can mail the materials to: **The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education, 1307 New York Ave., N.W., Suite 300, Washington, D.C. 20005.** Please feel free to photocopy the release form for future or additional submissions.

Should you have further questions, please contact me at 1-800-822-9229; or E-mail: lkelly@aacte.org.

Sincerely,

Linda M. Kelly
Acquisitions and Outreach Coordinator

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: info@ericfac.piccard.csc.com
WWW: http://ericfacility.org